



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/063,594	05/03/2002	Dan L. Eaton	10466/360	2707

9157 7590 01/04/2006
GENENTECH, INC.
1 DNA WAY
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

EXAMINER

WEGERT, SANDRA L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/063,594

Applicant(s)

EATON ET AL

Examiner

Sandra Wegert

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8 and 11-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8 and 11-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 May 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/8/05, 9/29/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Status of Application, Amendments, and/or Claims

The Remarks, submitted 29 September 2005, has been entered. The Information Disclosure Statements, submitted 8 July 2005 and 29 September 2005 have been entered. Claims 1-3, 9 and 10 were cancelled previously by Applicant (20 April 2005).

Claims 4-8 and 11-17 are under examination in the Instant Application.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code, not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Maintained Objections and/or Rejections

35 U.S.C. § 101/112, first paragraph-, Lack of Utility, Enablement.

Claims 4-8 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, as lacking utility. The reasons for this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are set forth at pp. 3-6 of the previous Office Action (28 June 2005). Claims 4-8 and 11-17 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth in the previous Office Action (28 June 2005), one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Applicants argue (29 September 2005, pages 7 and 8) that the results presented in the instant Specification are enabling for the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 88. They argue that PRO1270 message is differentially expressed in normal lung versus cancerous lung, and point to

Art Unit: 1647

the results of the expression assay (pages 140-143, Specification). The assay indicated showed a 2-fold or greater fluorescence in a sample of normal lung versus cancerous lung.

Applicant's arguments (29 September 2005) have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive for the following reasons:

In the instant case, the specification provides data showing an increase in message- in a normal lung tissue. However, there is no evidence regarding whether or not PRO1270 polypeptide levels are also increased. Furthermore, as discussed in the previous Office Action (28 June 2005, pages 4 and 5), what is often seen is a *lack* of correlation between DNA expression and increased peptide levels (Pennica, et al, 1998, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 95: 14717-14722). As discussed by Haynes et al (1998, Electrophoresis, 19: 1862-1871), polypeptide levels cannot be accurately predicted from mRNA levels, and that, according to the results presented, the ratio varies from zero to 50-fold (page 1863). The literature cautions researchers against drawing conclusions based on small changes in transcript expression levels between normal and cancerous lung tissue. For example, Hu et al. (2003, Journal of Proteome Research 2: 405-412) analyzed 2286 genes that showed a greater than 1-fold difference in mean expression level between breast cancer samples and normal samples in a microarray (p. 408, middle of right column). Hu et al. discovered that, for genes displaying a 5-fold change or less in tumors compared to normal, there was no evidence of a correlation between altered gene expression and a known role in the disease. However, among genes with a 10-fold or more change in expression level, there was a strong and significant correlation between expression level and a published role in the disease (see discussion section).

The specification of the instant application does not complement the low (2-fold) PRO1270 expression data with any protein studies. The skilled artisan would not reasonably assume that PRO1270 polypeptide is overexpressed in this normal tissue based on the disclosure, without actually testing for PRO1270 polypeptide underexpression.

Regarding Hu et al. (cited by the examiner in the previous Office Action), Applicant argues that Hu et al. does not conclusively show that it is more likely than not that the gene expression does not result in increased expression at the mRNA and polypeptide levels. Applicant contends that since Hu et al. only studied the statistical analysis of microarray data and not the gene expression data, their findings would not be directly applicable to the gene expression data. Applicants also state that Hu et al. manipulated various aspects of the input data. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive. The asserted utility for the claimed polypeptides is based on a sequence of presumptions. Firstly, since data were pooled and no statistics were presented, the instant disclosure does not reliably show fluorescence of PRO1270 within an experimental group. Secondly, it is presumed that increased mRNA production leads to increased protein production. Hu et al. is directly on point by showing that the second presumption is incorrect when designating proteins as diagnostic markers for cancer. Hu et al. (2003, Journal of Proteome Research 2:405-412) analyzed 2286 genes that showed a greater than 1-fold difference in mean expression level between breast cancer samples and normal samples in a microarray (p. 408, middle of right column) and discovered that, for genes displaying a 5-fold change or less in tumors compared to normal, there was no evidence of a correlation between altered gene expression and a known role in the disease. However, among genes with a 10-fold or more change in expression level, there was a

Art Unit: 1647

strong and significant correlation between expression level and a published role in the disease.

The instant specification does not disclose that PRO1270 mRNA levels are expressed at 10-fold or higher levels compared with normal, matched tissue samples. Therefore, based on Hu et al., the skilled artisan would not reasonably expect that PRO1270 protein can be used as a cancer diagnostic. Regarding Applicant's criticism of Hu et al.'s statistical analysis, Applicant is holding Hu et al. to a higher standard than their own specification, which does not provide proper statistical analysis such as reproducibility, standard error rates, etc. When viewed with the evidence of record as a whole, there is no correlation between gene expression, mRNA levels and protein levels. In view of the totality of the evidence, including the declarations submitted under 37 CFR 1.132 and the publications of record, the instant utility rejection is appropriate.

Applicants assert that the Patent Office has failed to meet its initial burden of proof that claims of Utility are not substantial or credible. They contend that the examiner's reasoning is based on a misrepresentation of the scientific data presented in the above cited references and application of an improper, heightened legal standard. Applicants state that the art indicates that, if a gene is amplified in a normal tissue, it is more likely than not that the encoded protein will be expressed at an elevated level.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive. The truth or credibility of the assertion of utility has not been questioned. Rather, the rejection sets forth that the assertion of utility is not substantial. The preponderance of evidence supports this position. See Pennica et al. (cited in the previous Office Action) and Hu et al. (who reviewed 2286 genes reported in the literature to be associated with breast cancer). These

Art Unit: 1647

references, taken into consideration with the disclosure, indicate to the skilled artisan that it is more likely than not that PRO1270 polypeptide is not useful as a cancer diagnostic agent.

Applicants discuss (Response, 29 September 2005, page 3 and throughout) points from case law in reference to the utility rejection, most of which the examiner agrees with. However, the fact patterns of the cases cited have little connection with utility/enablement as applied to the instant Application. Whatever the asserted specific utility might be - diagnosis of cancer, for example- it is **not** "more likely than not" (In re Oetiker, 1992, 977 F2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d) or true "to a reasonable probability" (Fujikawa v. Wattanasin, 1996, 93 F3d 1559, 39 USPQ2d 1895) since the increase in message was found in only one tissue sample.

Applicants indicate that the PRO1270 mRNA was amplified in a pooled normal lung tissue and showed a large increase in message, i.e., at least 2-fold expression. At pages 8-9 of the Response, Applicants argue that the expression of the nucleic acids encoding the claimed polypeptide is significant for the detection of normal lung and cite the Grimaldi Declaration. However, no substantially new arguments have been presented. These declarations were previously considered and discussed by the Examiner in the Office Action of 28 June 2005. However, it is again noted that the PRO1270 gene or mRNA has *not* been associated with tumor formation or the development of cancer, nor has it been shown to be predictive of such. The specification merely demonstrates that the PRO1270 nucleic acid was decreased in a cancer sample. No mutation or translocation of PRO1270 has been associated with any type of cancer. For these reasons, it is not clear that the reported expression is meaningful. In the absence of any of the above information, all that the specification has done is present evidence that the mRNA encoding PRO1270 is amplified in a normal lung tissue and invites the artisan to determine the

Art Unit: 1647

significance of this increase. One cannot determine from the data in the specification whether the observed “expression” of mRNA is a real measurement and due to an increase in transcription rates. It remains that, as evidenced by Pennica et al., the issue is simply not predictable, and the specification presents a mere invitation to experiment.

Therefore, based on the totality of the evidence, it is maintained that one skilled in the art would view the instant expression data as merely preliminary with regard to whether or not mRNA or protein levels of PRO1270 are specifically increased in normal lung. Further research would have to be done in order to determine if PRO1270 mRNA and protein are amplified and, if so, whether or not the expression is significant enough to reasonably confirm the usefulness of PRO1270 protein as a cancer marker. Thus, the claimed invention does not provide products or services in “currently available” to the public, and the asserted utility is not substantial.

The fact remains that the instant specification does not disclose whether or not the PRO1270 gene or protein is reliably overexpressed in any tumor tissues. The skilled artisan must perform further research in order to reasonably confirm overexpression and specificity of positive fluorescence. The requirement for such further research indicates that the asserted utility of PRO1270 as a cancer diagnostic agent is not substantial. The specification does not disclose the expression levels of PRO1270 protein in any tissue samples; such would have to be determined through further research on the part of the skilled artisan. Thus, even the utility proposed regarding the usefulness of PRO1270 protein in the diagnosis of cancer is not substantial. Finally, there is no disclosure regarding what treatment modality should be chosen by the clinician based on whether or not PRO1270 polypeptide is overexpressed. The

Art Unit: 1647

determination of such constitutes further experimentation, indicating that the asserted utility is not substantial.

Applicants contend that the Haynes data (cited by Examiner in previous Office Action) confirm that there is a general trend between protein expression and transcript levels, which meets the "more likely than not standard" and shows that a positive correlation exists between mRNA and protein. Applicant also points out that Haynes is not relevant to the current application because Haynes did not compare mRNA expression levels and protein levels in the same yeast cells and thus the analysis by Haynes is not applicable to the present application.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive. Haynes et al. clearly state "[p]rotein expression levels are not predictable from the mRNA expression levels" (pg 1863, top of left column) and "only the direct analysis of mature protein products can reveal their correct identities, their relevant state of modification and/or association and their amounts" (pg 1870, under concluding remarks).

Applicants cite Gygi, et al (1999, Mol. Cell. Biol., 19(3): 1720-1730) as evidence that mRNA and protein levels are highly correlated in mammalian tissues. However, the authors in that study concluded that mRNA levels are not predictive of protein levels. For example, they state: "We found that the correlation between mRNA and protein levels was insufficient to predict protein expression levels from quantitative mRNA data" (see Abstract). Likewise, in the Discussion, they summarized their data: "we speculate that there is no predictive correlation between steady-state levels of mRNA and those of protein in mammalian cells." It is true that the overall measured correlation coefficient was 0.935. However, the authors themselves discount this result, stating: "This number is highly biased by a small number of genes with very

Art Unit: 1647

large protein and message levels" (page 1726, second paragraph), and that for most genes the correlation coefficient is between -0.05 and 0.35 (see Figure 6).

Regardless of whether there is a correlation between mRNA and protein levels in a sample, the data presented in the instant Application do not show a meaningful positive response since the signal-to-noise ratio was small and only one normal lung tissue was positively stained or fluoresced.

Applicants conclude that one of skill in the art would reasonably expect in this instance, based on the expression data for the PRO1270 gene, that the PRO1270 polypeptide is concomitantly overexpressed. They argue that the PRO1270 polypeptides have utility in the diagnosis of cancer, and, based on such a utility, one of skill in the art would know exactly how to use the claimed polypeptides for diagnosis of cancer.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive. The Examiner concedes that the specification teaches how to make PRO1270 polypeptide. However, the specification fails to provide a substantial asserted utility for the claimed PRO1270 polypeptides (specifically, the specification fails to teach the skilled artisan how to use the claimed PRO1270 polypeptides without undue experimentation). As discussed above, PRO1270 message was found to be slightly amplified in sample of normal lung tissue compared to normal tissue. The literature reports that increased mRNA levels do not correlate with increased polypeptide levels in healthy tissue (see Haynes et al.) or cancerous lung tissue (see Hu et al). In view of the totality of the evidence, the skilled artisan would not reasonably assume that PRO1270 polypeptide is overexpressed in a certain normal tissue based on the disclosure

Art Unit: 1647

regarding gene expression without actually testing for PRO1270 polypeptide overexpression.

The requirement for such testing indicates that the asserted utility is not substantial, i.e., it is not in currently available form. Fourth, based on the disclosed data, the skilled artisan *also* would not presume that PRO1270 polypeptide is *not* overexpressed in certain tissues without actually testing for PRO1270 polypeptide levels. In view of such and the lack of guidance regarding how the physician would use information regarding PRO1270 polypeptide overexpression, or lack of overexpression, in categorizing a tumor and choosing a treatment modality, the asserted utility for PRO1270 polypeptide as a cancer diagnostic agent is not substantial. In view of the totality of the evidence, the rejections for lack of utility and enablement is proper.

35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph-, Written Description.

Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The reasons for this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, are set forth at pp. 9-10 of the previous Office Action (28 June 2005). Briefly, the Applicants were not in possession of all or a significant number of polypeptides that have 95-99% homology to SEQ ID NO: 88, while retaining the function of SEQ ID NO: 88.

Applicants discuss the legal standards applied when evaluating Written Description, including the requirement that written description depends on the nature of the invention and the amount of knowledge imparted to those skilled in the art by the disclosure (pages 24-26, 29 September 2005). The examiner takes no issue with the discussion of general requirements for

Art Unit: 1647

evaluating Written Description in this case. However, Applicants have not described or shown possession of all polypeptides 95-99% homologous to SEQ ID NO: 88, *that are functionally equivalent to SEQ ID NO: 88*. Nor have Applicants described a representative number of species that have 95-99% homology to SEQ ID NO: 88, such that it is clear that they were in possession of a genus of polypeptides functionally similar to SEQ ID NO: 88. Applicants screened for one PRO1270 sequence, and used that one sequence in expression protocols (see Example 130 and Table 8). There is no discussion in the instant disclosure about the structure of PRO1270, nor about related molecules, such that molecules that vary as much as 5% from PRO1270 could be evaluated for similarity of function. There is no discussion about the art-recognized molecules to which PRO1270 might be related. Indeed, the PRO1270 protein has not been identified.

Applicants produced PRO1270 recombinantly; therefore, there is no information about the molecule that might come from certain more-complicated isolation techniques (such as, for example, protein folding characteristics and charge). Applicants have not made sequences different from SEQ ID NO: 88 or 89 and have provided no information about related molecules.

As discussed in the previous Office Action (28 June 2005) even a very skilled artisan could not envision the detailed chemical structure of all or a significant number of encompassed PRO1270 polypeptides, and therefore, would not know how to make or use them. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of making. The claimed product *itself* is required. Recitation of the phrase "wherein said isolated polypeptide is more highly expressed in cancerous lung..." (Amended claims, 20 April 2005), is not adequate to describe the PRO1270 polypeptides that have 95-99% homology to the PRO1270 polypeptide, since there was no reduction to practice to

Art Unit: 1647

support the amended claims. Applicants made no variant polypeptides, and as recited in the current Written Description Guidelines, Applicants must have invented the subject matter that is claimed and must be in "possession" of the claimed genus (Federal Register, 2001, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, esp. page 1104, 3rd column).

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire **Later than SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Wegert whose telephone number is (571) 272-0895. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern Time).

Art Unit: 1647

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback, can be reached at (571) 272-0961.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SLW
12 December 2005


JANET L. ANDRES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER